

**From:** Dana Tulis/DC/USEPA/US  
**Sent:** 4/23/2012 8:39:05 AM  
**To:** Gilberto Irizarry/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Fw: Dimock: HQ EOC Virtual Environmental Unit Report of Activities - April 16, 2012 \*\* For Internal Use Only\*\*

Tito, did you ever send on, it's now looking like old news. Let me know, thanks.

---

Dana S. Tulis  
Deputy Office Director  
Office of Emergency Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
202-564-8600

----- Forwarded by Dana Tulis/DC/USEPA/US on 04/23/2012 08:37 AM -----

**From:** Mathy Stanislaus/DC/USEPA/US  
**To:** Dana Tulis/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Date:** 04/19/2012 05:41 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Fw: Dimock: HQ EOC Virtual Environmental Unit Report of Activities - April 16, 2012 \*\* For Internal Use Only\*\*

yes - please do

Mathy Stanislaus  
USEPA Assistant Administrator  
Office of Solid Waste & Emergency Response

**From:** Dana Tulis/DC/USEPA/US  
**To:** Mathy Stanislaus/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa Feldt/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Cc:** Larry Stanton/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Gilberto Irizarry/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Date:** 04/17/2012 03:45 PM  
**Subject:** Fw: Dimock: HQ EOC Virtual Environmental Unit Report of Activities - April 16, 2012 \*\* For Internal Use Only\*\*

Mathy, fyi. let us know if you want to further distribute.

---

Dana S. Tulis  
Deputy Office Director  
Office of Emergency Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
202-564-8600

\*\*For Internal Use Only, Do Not Distribute\*\*

**HQ EOC - Environmental Unit (EU) Report of Activities**  
Dimock, PA - 3rd week sampling data (independent review) and support  
Date: April 16, 2012

•On Wednesday, April 11th the HQ EU (virtual) completed an independent review of the laboratory analysis results for the 17 locations sampled during week 3 (2/6/12 - 2/10/12). More specifically, the HQ EU received from R3 and reviewed two complete sets of data for the 17 sampled locations. One set consisted of draft Residential Data Reports (in PDF) and the second set consisted of toxicological reports for the same 17 sampled locations. The toxicological reports included additional information (e.g., lab qualifiers and notations on various comparison levels) not included in the residential reports to assist with the independent tox reviews. The data reviewed has already undergone laboratory QA/QC and validation. Alike the review for the 2nd week of sampling results, the HQ EU review focused on comparing results against trigger levels and any other appropriate toxicology/risk assessment considerations. In addition, the sampling results were reviewed to verify general applicability of data as pertinent to the overall project and to identify potential anomalous data (e.g., excessive concentrations or unexpected data, naming conventions, unit conversions, reporting limits, comparison of duplicate samples, interference by other analytes, inconsistent results) that may require further review by the region.

•The following summarizes the principal findings of the review:

- This 3rd week of sampling data included compounds above their respective trigger levels (i.e., lithium, sodium) that had been previously identified during the first two weeks of results.
- Noted samples with detections of other compounds such as arsenic, barium, chromium and lead. Generally, these were found in samples at the well head for unfiltered water, but then found below trigger levels in filtered well head or tap water samples.
- Noted samples with detections above the trigger level for manganese at two wells. In one instance, the detections above the trigger were for unfiltered and filtered samples collected at the well head only. In the other instance, levels above the trigger level were found at the tap as well as at the well head. The levels found did not suggest needed action(s). Additionally, this same well also included high concentrations of calcium, magnesium and sodium. These are consistent levels found in untreated "hard water" wells. This residence is identified as having a water softener treatment system.
- Noted that issues identified and addressed during the review of the 2nd week of sampling results involving laboratory analytics (e.g., recommended reporting units, low level detections of some compounds likely to be lab artifact related, reporting limits. reviewing added data results) did not come up in this 3rd week of sampling results.
- No questions and/or issues of toxicology and risk levels were identified through the review of the 3rd week of sampling results which required ORD's technical expert support, although the communication materials were reviewed by ORD.

•Following the above noted review, on April 12 a member of the HQ EU communicated with R3 technical staff (including the R3 toxicologist) and discussed their respective findings. Both (i.e., R3 and HQ EU) agreed on their findings.

•On April 11, the HQ EU reviewed and provided feedback on initial draft messaging for manganese. On April 13, the HQ EU reviewed and provided feedback on the consolidated Statement and Reactive Q and A's that were drafted for this 3rd week of sampling data results.

•On April 11, staff from the HQ EU participated in a call with R3 and ORD HQ personnel on isotopic methane sampling. ORD is identifying options for follow-up use of this sampling data.